

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **The Elusiveness of Preferences**

***How adequately do the two models of democracy, representative and deliberative, recognize citizens' preferences?***

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Politics

At Massey University, Albany, New Zealand.

Patricia Veronica Price

2016



## **Abstract**

This thesis considers the way in which political decisions are made in New Zealand and how well the core democratic principles of equality and liberty are acknowledged. I begin by acknowledging the definition of deliberative democracy by Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson and consider the three ways of doing politics set out by Jon Elster. I give special attention to Jürgen Habermas's belief that political decision-making is a public matter and therefore dependent on the speech acts involved, as expressed in his theory of communicative action. This is a demanding theory but one which supports the deliberative ideal that all those affected by a decision are entitled to participate in arriving at the solution. One of the criticisms of deliberative democracy is that there is no procedure to legitimize the decision. Joshua Cohen disagrees. I look at his 'intuitive' belief that the process of arriving at the solution gives that solution legitimacy and he outlines the institutions that would assist in this process.

The two case studies are examples of the two models of democracy in action: representative, the by-election, and deliberative, the proposed reorganisation of local government. As a region, Northland has challenges that have not been addressed; this suggests that our present political arrangements do not acknowledge citizens' preferences adequately. In seeking a solution for a plural society, I look at the work of Jane Mansbridge, Anne Phillips, Will Kymlicka and Iris Marion Young, in particular, and also suggestions from local bloggers.



## **Acknowledgements:**

I would like to thank my supervisor, Associate-Professor Grant Duncan, for his guidance in the writing of this thesis. By expecting the theoretical to be supported by the empirical he took me out of my comfort zone with the result that my thesis took a somewhat different direction from what I originally envisaged. And I am glad of it. Politics is, after all, about what is possible in real life. The theory might be interesting but it has to work, something I'm inclined to forget. I appreciate Grant's patience with my false starts. He regularly challenged me to think more precisely and write more neutrally and thus present my argument more coherently. I am grateful. I would also like to thank Dr. Krushil Watene who read an early draft of the thesis and offered suggestions on structure.



## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 1: An Historical Overview</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1: In the beginning	4
1.1.2: Much later	7
1.2: The search for a more inclusive way	11
1.2.1: Three ways of doing politics	13
1.2.2: Jürgen Habermas and the public sphere	18
1.2.3: Joshua Cohen on legitimacy	25
<b>Chapter 2: The Two Models of Democracy</b>	<b>31</b>
2.1: The Case for Representative Democracy	34
2.2: The Case for Deliberative Democracy	47
2.3: Areas of Tension	56
2.4: Conclusion	65
<b>Chapter 3: Two Case Studies and an Observation</b>	<b>67</b>
Case Study 1: Northland By-election, 2015	69
Case Study 2: Draft Proposal for Local Government	82
Postscript: The Hundertwasser Decision	105
<b>Chapter 4: Reflections on the Case Studies</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Chapter 5: Looking Towards the Future</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>158</b>